UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/478,313	01/06/2000	MICHAEL HUSAYN KALANTAR	YO999-417	1524

7590 04/20/2004

ANNE VACHON DOUGHERTY
3173 CEDAR ROAD
YORKTOWN HEIGHTS, NY 10598

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, QUANG N	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/478,313	KALANTAR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Quang N. Nguyen	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 March 2004* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *06 January 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/11/2003 has been entered.

Claims 1-20 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 5, 15-16 and 20 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. Claims 1-13 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Gabber et al. (US 5,961,593), herein after referred as Gabber.

4. As to claim 1, Gabber teaches a method for providing common data from a first source entity to a second entity, wherein said second entity is to perform processing on the common data, comprising the steps of:

transferring the common data *(the requested destination website address, user specific information such as user ID, passwords, email addresses, telephone numbers, credit card numbers, postal address, etc.)* from the first source entity (*users at user site 105a)* to be stored at the second entity *(central proxy system 110a)* for subsequent processing on said common data by more than one of said plurality of different service applications *(such as processing substitute identifiers that may be constructed by applying pseudo-random and hash functions to the data received from user site 105a; transmitting the alias or processed user specific information mapped or contained in the substitute identifiers to the server site 110; employing a mail-collecting routine that automatically locates user site 105a's various mailboxes and retrieves the mail therefrom once the user has supplied the appropriate data; providing its own valid credit card number to requesting site and then collect money from its users; etc.)* (Gabber, C7: L62-67, C8: L1-2 and L22-34, C10: L23-47 and L66-67, C11: L1-6, C12: L40-44);

storing the common data as stored data at said second entity *(the central proxy system 110a maintains a conventional data structure to maintain the same, such as a database, data repository, an array, etc., or even an alias table, that maybe used to store and map user information to their substitute identifiers)* (Gabber, C7: L34-38 and C10: L37-40);

associating a data handle to the stored data *(constructing/generating/associating one or more substitute identifiers from data specific to user 105a)*, wherein said first and said second entity each are aware of the handle (Gabber, C8: L22-39); and

invoking service on said common data *(data received from user site 105a)* by using said data handle *(substitute identifiers)* and invocation-specific data *(the destination address, i.e., the URL address of the NEW YORK TRIBUTE website "NYT")* to invoke processing on the common data by said plurality of different service applications *(providing personalized service to subsequent visits to the same website by the user, proving and supporting anonymously authentication in email services, electronic payment services for online shopping, etc.)* (Gabber, C11: L37 – C13: L14).

5. As to claim 2, Gabber teaches the method as in claim 1, further comprising storing the data handle with the stored data *(the central proxy system 110a maintains a conventional data structure to maintain the same, such as a database, data repository, an array, etc., or even an alias table, that maybe used to store and map user information to their substitute identifiers)* (Gabber, C7: L34-38 and C10: L37-40).

6. As to claim 3, Gabber teaches the method as in claim 1, wherein said transferring *(user specific information)* and said invoking are done simultaneously (*forwarding requests on subsequent visit to websites 110g)* and wherein said method comprises invoking at least one successive service on said common data by using said data handle after said storing and associating steps (Gabber, C10: L22 – C11: L6).

7. As to claim 4, Gabber teaches the method as in claim 1, wherein the first entity invokes the at least one service *(user's subsequent visit/request to access the NYT-site, checking email, or online shopping)* by providing at least service invocation-specific data *(the requested destination website address)* and said data handle *(substitute identifiers)* to said second entity *(central proxy system 110a)* (Gabber, C11: L37-53).

8. As to claim 5, Gabber teaches the method as in claim 1, wherein said first entity invokes a plurality of services on said common data by transferring a composite service invocation to said second entity *(i.e., users at user site 105a send requests to central proxy system 110a for specific data/information, services such as retrieving emails, online-purchases, stock quotes, etc.)* (Gabber, C6: L40-44).

9. As to claims 6-8, Gabber teaches the method as in claim 1, wherein said associating of the handle is conducted at either first entity, second entity or third entity and wherein the handle is transferred to the other two entities *(the substitute, or alias, identifiers are generated/constructed either at the user site, the local proxy system, the central proxy system, or at any other proxy site)* (Gabber, C6: L17-37 and C13: L15-53).

10. As to claim 9, Gabber teaches the method as in claim 1, wherein said associating of a handle is performed implicitly by the transfer of said common data *(central proxy system 110a computes substitute identifiers based on user identification, password and*

other secret information transferred from users at user site 105a) (Gabber, C8: L22-39 and C13: L64 – C14: L3).

11. As to claims 10-12, Gabber teaches the method as in claims 1 and 3, further comprising transforming said common data from a first representation to a second representation, i.e., encryption of said common data and transferring across a network *(central proxy system 110a transforms user 105a specific information such as user ID, passwords, email addresses, telephone numbers, credit card numbers, etc., to aliases or substitute identifiers and transmits/retransmits across a network to a particular server site 110g for accessing specific information or services)* (Gabber, C11: L7-58, C12: L45-67 and C13: L1-14).

12. As to claim 13, Gabber teaches the method as in claim 4, wherein said at least one service comprises file I/O by the second entity *(central proxy system 110a transmits/retransmits user 105a data/service requests to web servers 110g, receives and forwards the requested data/service to the user 105a after removing or substituting portions of the browsing commands that would identify the user identity to the server sites)* (Gabber, C14: L66-67 and C15: L1-7).

13. Claim 15 is a corresponding system claim of method claim 1; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

14. Claim 16 is a corresponding system claim of method claim 5; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

15. As to claim 17, Gabber teaches the system of claim 15, wherein said at least one data handle component comprises a component of said first entity *(e.g., user site 105a IP address, user ID, passwords, email addresses, telephone numbers, credit card numbers, etc.)* (Gabber, C8: L17-34).

16. As to claim 18, Gabber teaches the system of claim 15, wherein said at least one data handle component comprises a component of second entity *(central proxy system's IP address, credit card number, etc.)* (Gabber, C12: L57 – C13: L14).

17. As to claim 19, Gabber teaches the system of claim 15, wherein said first entity is located in a separate protection domain from said second entity (Gabber, C8: L5-12).

18. Claim 20 is a corresponding program storage device claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

20. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gabber, in view of Draves (US 5,802,590).

21. As to claim 14, Gabber teaches a method as in claim 4, wherein the service is provided by the second entity *(the first routine of the central proxy system applies pseudo-random and hash functions to the data received from user site 105a to generate substitute identifiers)* but does not explicitly teach the second entity comprises a kernel.

In the related art, Draves teaches a system and method for allowing processes to access resources wherein a kernel of an operating system maintains a system-wide resource table containing resource entries (Draves, Figs. 2-3 and corresponding text, C3: L42-67, C4: L1-14, L48-67, C5 and C6: L1-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify and combine the teachings of Gabber and Draves to include a kernel in the second entity because it would allow the system to use the kernel to hash the key to generate/compute the handle associating to the stored resources.

Response to Arguments

22. In the remarks, applicant argued in substance that

(**A**) Prior Art does not teach or suggest that common data transferred by a user (first entity) to a proxy server (second entity) so that the common data can be operated on by more than one different service application at the proxy server.

As to point (**A**), **Gabber** teaches *a central proxy system 110a constructing substitute identifiers by applying pseudo-random and hash functions to the data received from user site 105a; transmitting the alias or processed user specific information mapped or constructed in the substitute identifiers to the server site 110; employing a mail-collecting routine that automatically locates user site 105a's various mailboxes and retrieves the mail therefrom once the user has supplied the appropriate data, i.e., user ID/passwords, email addresses, telephone numbers; providing its own "proxy" valid credit card number to requesting site and then collect money from its users, i.e., from user's credit card, checking account, etc.)* (**Gabber**, C7: L62-67, C8: L1-2 and L22-34, C10: L23-47 and L66-67, C11: L1-6 and C12: L40-44). Hence, **Gabber** does teach that common data be transferred by a user (first entity) to a proxy server (second entity) so that the common data can be operated on by more than one different service application at the proxy server, as is broadly claimed.

(**B**) Prior Art does not teach or suggest the claimed step of storing the common data as stored data at said second entity.

As to claim (**B**), **Gabber** teaches *the central proxy system 110a maintains a conventional data structure to maintain the same, such as a database, data repository, an array, etc., or even an alias table, that maybe used to store and map user information to their substitute identifiers)* (**Gabber**, C7: L34-38 and C10: L37-40).

(**C**) Prior Art does not anticipate the claimed step of invoking service on the common data by using said data handle and invocation-specific data to invoke processing on the common data by the different service applications.

As to point (**C**), **Gabber** teaches the step of invoking service on said common data *(data received from user site 105a)* by using said data handle *(substitute identifiers)* and invocation-specific data *(the requested destination website addresses, i.e., the URL address of the NEW YORK TRIBUTE website "NYT")* to invoke processing on the common data by said plurality of different service applications *(providing personalized service to subsequent visits to the same website by the user, proving and supporting anonymously authentication in email services, electronic payment services for online shopping, etc., using the user provided information such as the requested destination website addresses, user specific information such as user ID, passwords, email addresses, telephone numbers, credit card numbers, postal address, etc.)* (**Gabber**, C11: L37 – C13: L14).

23. Applicant's arguments as well as request for reconsideration filed on 03/11/2004 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

24. A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire THREE (3) months from the mailing date of this communication. See 37 CFR 1.134.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quang N. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-8190.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's SPE, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (703) 305-4003. The fax phone number for the organization is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800/4700.

Quang N. Nguyen

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER